

# MONETARY POLICY, CAPITAL CONTROLS, AND INTERNATIONAL PORTFOLIOS

BY SEBASTIÁN FANELLI

Discussion by Florencia S. Airaudó (UC3M)

**30th CEPR European Summer Symposium in International  
Macroeconomics**

May 2023

# Motivation

- Large increase in cross-border holding of financial assets → **risk-sharing role of monetary policy**

# Motivation

- Large increase in cross-border holding of financial assets → **risk-sharing role of monetary policy**
- The strength of this channel depends on the portfolio composition → **potential role for capital controls**

# Motivation

- Large increase in cross-border holding of financial assets → **risk-sharing role of monetary policy**
- The strength of this channel depends on the portfolio composition → **potential role for capital controls**
- This paper: studies optimal monetary policy, portfolio choice, and capital controls (with commitment)

# Motivation

- Large increase in cross-border holding of financial assets → **risk-sharing role of monetary policy**
- The strength of this channel depends on the portfolio composition → **potential role for capital controls**
- This paper: studies optimal monetary policy, portfolio choice, and capital controls (with commitment)
- Setup: SOE model with incomplete markets, nominal rigidities, endogenous portfolio choice

## 2 periods static model

- Home households maximize

$$\mathbb{E} U(C_{Ts}, C_{Ns}, L_s)$$

Subject to:  $(1 + \tau_B) B + B^* = T_0$

$$C_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} P_{Ns} C_{Ns} = Y_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} W_s L_s + E_s^{-1} \Pi_{Ns} + R E_s^{-1} B + B^*$$

## 2 periods static model

- Home households maximize

$$\mathbb{E} U(C_{Ts}, C_{Ns}, L_s)$$

Subject to:  $(1 + \tau_B) B + B^* = T_0$

$$C_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} P_{Ns} C_{Ns} = Y_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} W_s L_s + E_s^{-1} \Pi_{Ns} + R E_s^{-1} B + B^*$$

- Nontradable firm:  $Y_{Ns} = Z_s L_s, \quad P_{Ns} = 1 \quad \forall s \in S$

## 2 periods static model

- Home households maximize

$$\mathbb{E} U(C_{Ts}, C_{Ns}, L_s)$$

Subject to:  $(1 + \tau_B) B + B^* = T_0$

$$C_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} P_{Ns} C_{Ns} = Y_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} W_s L_s + E_s^{-1} \Pi_{Ns} + R E_s^{-1} B + B^*$$

- Nontradable firm:  $Y_{Ns} = Z_s L_s, \quad P_{Ns} = 1 \quad \forall s \in S$

- Foreign household:  $\mathbb{E} \left[ (R E_s^{-1} - 1) \frac{dU^*}{dC^*}(s) \right] = 0$



## 2 periods static model

- Home households maximize

$$\mathbb{E} U(C_{Ts}, C_{Ns}, L_s)$$

Subject to:  $(1 + \tau_B) B + B^* = T_0$

$$C_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} P_{Ns} C_{Ns} = Y_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} W_s L_s + E_s^{-1} \Pi_{Ns} + R E_s^{-1} B + B^*$$

- Nontradable firm:  $Y_{Ns} = Z_s L_s, \quad P_{Ns} = 1 \quad \forall s \in S$

- Foreign household:  $\mathbb{E} \left[ (R E_s^{-1} - 1) \frac{dU^*}{dC^*}(s) \right] = 0$

- Central bank: sets a state-contingent exchange rate policy rule  $\{E_s\}_{s \in S}$  and portfolio taxes such that:  $T_0 = \tau_B B$

## 2 periods static model

- Home households maximize

$$\mathbb{E} U(C_{Ts}, C_{Ns}, L_s)$$

Subject to:  $(1 + \tau_B) B + B^* = T_0$

$$C_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} P_{Ns} C_{Ns} = Y_{Ts} + E_s^{-1} W_s L_s + E_s^{-1} \Pi_{Ns} + R E_s^{-1} B + B^*$$

- Nontradable firm:  $Y_{Ns} = Z_s L_s, \quad P_{Ns} = 1 \quad \forall s \in S$

- Foreign household:  $\mathbb{E} \left[ (R E_s^{-1} - 1) \frac{dU^*}{dC^*}(s) \right] = 0$

- Central bank: sets a state-contingent exchange rate policy rule  $\{E_s\}_{s \in S}$  and portfolio taxes such that:  $T_0 = \tau_B B$

- Market clearing conditions:  $C_{Ts} = Y_{Ts} + (R E_s^{-1} - 1) B, \quad C_{Ns} = Z_s L_s$

# Planner's problem

**Incomplete markets:** choose  $\{C_{T_s}\}_s$ ,  $\{E_s\}_s$  and  $B$  to solve:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \mathbb{E}V(C_{T_s}, E_s; Z_s) \\ \text{s.t. } & C_{T_s} = Y_{T_s} + (RE_s^{-1} - 1) B \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[ (RE_s^{-1} - 1) \frac{dU^*}{dC^*}(s) \right] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

# Planner's problem

**Incomplete markets:** choose  $\{C_{T_s}\}_s$ ,  $\{E_s\}_s$  and  $B$  to solve:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \mathbb{E}V(C_{T_s}, E_s; Z_s) \\ \text{s.t. } & C_{T_s} = Y_{T_s} + (RE_s^{-1} - 1) B \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[ (RE_s^{-1} - 1) \frac{dU^*}{dC^*}(s) \right] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

- Nominal rigidities: Demand management

# Planner's problem

**Incomplete markets:** choose  $\{C_{T_s}\}_s$ ,  $\{E_s\}_s$  and  $B$  to solve:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \mathbb{E}V(C_{T_s}, E_s; Z_s) \\ \text{s.t. } & C_{T_s} = Y_{T_s} + (RE_s^{-1} - 1) B \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[ (RE_s^{-1} - 1) \frac{dU^*}{dC^*}(s) \right] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

- Nominal rigidities: Demand management
- $E_s$  linked to the transfer  $\mathcal{T}_s$  by  $\mathcal{T}_s = (RE_s^{-1} - 1) B$ : Insurance role

# Optimal policy

Almost linear-quadratic approximation

$$\max_{\{e_s\}_s, \bar{B}} -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \underbrace{(e_s - e_s^{dm})^2}_{\text{demand management}} + \chi \bar{B}^2 \underbrace{(e_s - e_s^{in}(\bar{B}))^2}_{\text{insurance}} \right] + t.i.p. + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$$

where  $e_s^{dm} = \frac{1}{\alpha} z_s$

and  $e_s^{in}(\bar{B}) = -\frac{1}{\bar{B}} \underbrace{(-\alpha y_{Ts} + \alpha c_{Ts}^*)}_{=\mathcal{T}_s}$

# Optimal policy

Almost linear-quadratic approximation

$$\max_{\{e_s\}_s, \bar{B}} -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \underbrace{(e_s - e_s^{dm})^2}_{\text{demand management}} + \chi \bar{B}^2 \underbrace{(e_s - e_s^{in}(\bar{B}))^2}_{\text{insurance}} \right] + t.i.p. + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$$

where  $e_s^{dm} = \frac{1}{\alpha} z_s$

and  $e_s^{in}(\bar{B}) = -\frac{1}{\bar{B}} \underbrace{(-\alpha y_{Ts} + \alpha c_{Ts}^*)}_{=\mathcal{T}_s}$

**Policy trade-off with nominal rigidities:**

- $\uparrow z_s$ :  $\uparrow e_s^{dm}$  to reduce the relative price of NT and close the output gap.  $\bar{e}_{in,s}$

# Optimal policy

Almost linear-quadratic approximation

$$\max_{\{e_s\}_s, \bar{B}} -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \underbrace{(e_s - e_s^{dm})^2}_{\text{demand management}} + \chi \bar{B}^2 \underbrace{(e_s - e_s^{in}(\bar{B}))^2}_{\text{insurance}} \right] + t.i.p. + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$$

where  $e_s^{dm} = \frac{1}{\alpha} z_s$

and  $e_s^{in}(\bar{B}) = -\frac{1}{\bar{B}} \underbrace{(-\alpha y_{Ts} + \alpha c_{Ts}^*)}_{=\mathcal{T}_s}$

**Policy trade-off with nominal rigidities:**

- $\uparrow z_s$ :  $\uparrow e_s^{dm}$  to reduce the relative price of NT and close the output gap.  $\bar{e}_{in,s}$
- $\uparrow y_{Ts}$ :  $\bar{e}_s^{dm}$  since the relative price between T-NT does not change under flexible prices.  $\uparrow e_s^{in}$  if  $\bar{B} > 0$ ,  $\downarrow e_s^{in}$  if  $\bar{B} < 0$



# Optimal policy: main results

**Optimal monetary policy rule (given  $\bar{B}$ ):**

$$e_s^{op}(\bar{B}) = (1 - \omega(\bar{B}))e_s^{dm} + \omega(\bar{B})e_s^{in}(\bar{B}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$$

where  $\omega(\bar{B}) = \frac{\chi \bar{B}^2}{1 + \chi \bar{B}^2}$ .

**Result 1:** The optimal exchange rate is a weighted average of the two targets.

# Optimal policy: main results

**Optimal monetary policy rule (given  $\bar{B}$ ):**

$$e_s^{op}(\bar{B}) = (1 - \omega(\bar{B}))e_s^{dm} + \omega(\bar{B})e_s^{in}(\bar{B}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$$

where  $\omega(\bar{B}) = \frac{\chi \bar{B}^2}{1 + \chi \bar{B}^2}$ .

**Result 1:** The optimal exchange rate is a weighted average of the two targets.

The optimal weight on the insurance target  $\omega$  increases with:

- Preferences and technology ( $\chi$ )
- Large gross positions  $|\bar{B}|$
- Relative likelihood of shocks: **state dependent policy**

# Optimal policy: main results

**Optimal monetary policy rule (given  $\bar{B}$ ):**

$$e_s^{op}(\bar{B}) = (1 - \omega(\bar{B}))e_s^{dm} + \omega(\bar{B})e_s^{in}(\bar{B}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$$

where  $\omega(\bar{B}) = \frac{\chi \bar{B}^2}{1 + \chi \bar{B}^2}$ .

**Result 1:** The optimal exchange rate is a weighted average of the two targets.

The optimal weight on the insurance target  $\omega$  increases with:

- Preferences and technology ( $\chi$ )
- Large gross positions  $|\bar{B}|$
- Relative likelihood of shocks: **state dependent policy**

**Result 2: Optimal portfolio**

- $|\bar{B}|$  increases with the insurance motive
- $\downarrow \sigma_e^2 / \sigma_{e^{dm}}^2$  if the insurance motive is relatively more important

# No role for taxes to portfolio composition

Optimality of the portfolio implies:

$$\underbrace{\frac{\partial V}{\partial C_T}(s)}_{\text{social marginal utility}} = \underbrace{\frac{\partial U}{\partial C_T}(s)}_{\text{private marginal utility}} - \underbrace{\alpha^{-1}(1-\alpha)(e_s - e_s^{dm})}_{\text{aggregate demand externality}} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$$

# No role for taxes to portfolio composition

Optimality of the portfolio implies:

$$\underbrace{\frac{\partial V}{\partial C_T}(s)}_{\text{social marginal utility}} = \underbrace{\frac{\partial U}{\partial C_T}(s)}_{\text{private marginal utility}} - \underbrace{\alpha^{-1}(1-\alpha)(e_s - e_s^{dm})}_{\text{aggregate demand externality}} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$$

- Typically  $e_s \neq e_s^{dm}$ , then  $\tau_B \neq 0$  as in Farhi and Werning, 2016.

# No role for taxes to portfolio composition

Optimality of the portfolio implies:

$$\underbrace{\frac{\partial V}{\partial C_T}(s)}_{\text{social marginal utility}} = \underbrace{\frac{\partial U}{\partial C_T}(s)}_{\text{private marginal utility}} - \underbrace{\alpha^{-1}(1-\alpha)(e_s - e_s^{dm})}_{\text{aggregate demand externality}} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$$

- Typically  $e_s \neq e_s^{dm}$ , then  $\tau_B \neq 0$  as in Farhi and Werning, 2016.
- **Result 3:** As risk vanishes, the private portfolio decision is asymptotically efficient, and the tax  $\tau_B$  approaches zero.

# How can we relate the results to the data?

- Extension: DSGE model calibrated to Canada

# How can we relate the results to the data?

- Extension: DSGE model calibrated to Canada
- Demand for insurance: driven by foreign shocks ( $r^*$  and  $y^*$ )



# How can we relate the results to the data?

- Extension: DSGE model calibrated to Canada
- Demand for insurance: driven by foreign shocks ( $r^*$  and  $y^*$ )
- Optimal policy: **stabilizing demand** with weight of 89%

# How can we relate the results to the data?

- Extension: DSGE model calibrated to Canada
- Demand for insurance: driven by foreign shocks ( $r^*$  and  $y^*$ )
- Optimal policy: **stabilizing demand** with weight of 89%

Can we say something about how far away countries are from **optimal monetary policy** according to this model?

# How can we relate the results to the data?

- Extension: DSGE model calibrated to Canada
- Demand for insurance: driven by foreign shocks ( $r^*$  and  $y^*$ )
- Optimal policy: **stabilizing demand** with weight of 89%

Can we say something about how far away countries are from **optimal monetary policy** according to this model?

$$e = (1 - \omega) \underbrace{e^{dm}}_{\substack{\text{Demand} \\ \text{Management}}} + \omega \underbrace{e^{in}}_{\substack{\text{Insurance}}} \\ \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \\ \text{Output Volatility} \qquad \text{Consumption Volatility}$$

# How can we relate the results to the data?

- Extension: DSGE model calibrated to Canada
- Demand for insurance: driven by foreign shocks ( $r^*$  and  $y^*$ )
- Optimal policy: **stabilizing demand** with weight of 89%

Can we say something about how far away countries are from **optimal monetary policy** according to this model?

$$e = (1 - \omega) \underbrace{e^{dm}}_{\substack{\text{Demand} \\ \text{Management} \\ \downarrow \\ \text{Output Volatility}}} + \omega \underbrace{e^{in}}_{\substack{\text{Insurance} \\ \downarrow \\ \text{Consumption Volatility}}}$$

Emerging countries: characterized by  $\frac{\sigma^c}{\sigma^y} > 1$

**Could this be explained by a more important role for insurance?** →  
More exposed to external shocks

## How can we relate the results to the data?

- If insurance demand increases, countries should  $\uparrow |\bar{B}|$

# How can we relate the results to the data?

- If insurance demand increases, countries should  $\uparrow |\bar{B}|$
- Did financial integration help (some) emerging countries get closer to their optimal monetary policy?

## How can we relate the results to the data?

- If insurance demand increases, countries should  $\uparrow |\bar{B}|$
- Did financial integration help (some) emerging countries get closer to their optimal monetary policy?
- Caveat: no financial frictions

# How can we relate the results to the data?

- If insurance demand increases, countries should  $\uparrow |\bar{B}|$
- Did financial integration help (some) emerging countries get closer to their optimal monetary policy?
- Caveat: no financial frictions
- **Financial frictions can affect optimal monetary policy and capital controls:** Mendoza (2006), Mendoza and Bianchi (2010), Bianchi (2011), Jeanne and Korinek (2013), Schmitt-Grohe and Uribe (2016)  
*Same intuition in this model, when  $\bar{B}$  is fixed*



# How can we relate the results to the data?

- If insurance demand increases, countries should  $\uparrow |\bar{B}|$
- Did financial integration help (some) emerging countries get closer to their optimal monetary policy?
- Caveat: no financial frictions
- **Financial frictions can affect optimal monetary policy and capital controls:** Mendoza (2006), Mendoza and Bianchi (2010), Bianchi (2011), Jeanne and Korinek (2013), Schmitt-Grohe and Uribe (2016)  
*Same intuition in this model, when  $\bar{B}$  is fixed*
- Could benefit from studying the role of financial frictions:
  - ▶ **Reduced-form** financial friction (debt elastic interest rate as in Justiniano and Preston (2010))
  - ▶ Endogenous spread as in the literature of **portfolio choice** (market segmentation: Vayanos and Vila (2021), Itskhoki and Mukhin (2021), Gourinchas, Ray Vayanos (2021)) or **borrowing limits** (Bianchi (2011))

# Thank you!

- I enjoyed reading the paper very much, and I learned a lot!
- Intuitive results in a very tractable model, also generalized to a broad set of extensions: multiple assets, infinite horizon, dynamic setting
- Great framework to think about optimal monetary policy with a portfolio choice in small open economies
- Could benefit from explaining the contribution to the literature:
  - ▶ Optimal capital controls
  - ▶ Portfolio choice